

Thomas N. Millikan, Bar No. 234430
 TMillikan@perkinscoie.com
 Joseph P. Reid, Bar No. 211082
 JReid@perkinscoie.com
 PERKINS COIE LLP
 11452 El Camino Real, Suite 300
 San Diego, CA 92130
 Telephone: 858.720.5700
 Facsimile: 858.720.5799
 Andrew N. Klein, Bar No. 300221
 AKlein@perkinscoie.com
 PERKINS COIE LLP
 3150 Porter Drive
 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1212
 Telephone: 650.838.4300
 Facsimile: 650.838.4350

Attorneys for Plaintiff Netskope, Inc.

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 SULLIVAN, LLP
 David A. Nelson (Illinois State Bar No. 6209623;
pro hac vice application forthcoming)
 davidnelson@quinnemanuel.com
 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
 Chicago, Illinois 60606
 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401
 Sean S. Pak (Bar No. 219032)
 seanpak@quinnemanuel.com
 Andrew M. Holmes (Bar No. 260475)
 drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
 Tigran Guledjian (Bar No. 207613)
 tigranguledjian@quinnemanuel.com
 Jordan B. Kaericher (Bar No. 265953)
 jordankaericher@quinnemanuel.com
 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Attorneys for Defendant Fortinet, Inc

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

NETSKOPE, INC.,

Plaintiff and Counterclaim-
 defendant,

v.

FORTINET, INC.,

Defendant and Counterclaim-
 plaintiff.

Case No. 3:22-cv-01852-TLT

**STIPULATION REQUESTING
 EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FORTINET,
 INC. TO OPPOSE NETSKOPE, INC.'S
 MOTION TO STAY CASE PENDING
 INTER PARTES REVIEW**

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant Netskope, Inc.
2 (“Netskope”) and Defendant and Counterclaimant Fortinet, Inc. (“Fortinet”), by and through their
3 attorneys, stipulate to a 4-day extension for Fortinet to oppose Netskope’s Motion to Stay Case
4 Pending *Inter Partes* Review. The parties declare the following in support of the extension:

5 WHEREAS, Netskope filed its Motion to Stay Case Pending *Inter Partes* Review (the
6 “Motion”) on November 17, 2022;

7 WHEREAS, Fortinet’s opposition to the Motion is due December 1, 2022;

8 WHEREAS, Fortinet has requested a 4-day extension of time to oppose the Motion;

9 WHEREAS, Netskope has agreed to the request for extension;

10 WHEREAS, the requested extension will not change any event or deadline currently set by the
11 Court;

12 NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by the parties that
13 Netskope shall have until December 5, 2022 to oppose Netskope’s Motion.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: November 23, 2022

By: /s/ Joseph P. Reid
Joseph P. Reid
JReid@perkinscoie.com Thomas N. Millikan
TMillikan@perkinscoie.com
Andrew N. Klein
AKlein@perkinscoie.com
Perkins Coie LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiff Netskope, Inc.

6 DATED: November 23, 2022

By: /s/ Tigran Guledjian
Tigran Guledjian
tigranguledjian@quinnemanuel.com
Andrew M. Holmes
drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com
Jordan B. Kaericher
jordankaericher@quinnemanuel.com
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP
Attorneys for Defendant Fortinet, Inc.

13 Pursuant to Stipulation, **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 DATED: November 28, 2022


Hon. Trina L. Thompson
U.S. District Court Judge.